

Remarks

I. Status of claims

Claims 1-21, 23-30, and 32-40 are pending.

The amendments to the claims replace each instance of "label" with --replacement reference--. The claimed "replacement reference" corresponds to the simple references described in page 16, lines 18-19 and the references "1", "2", "3", "4", and "5" contained in the sessionID_Inbox.xml file disclosed on page 18, lines 10-34.

II. Information disclosure statement

In the Office action dated January 23, 2006, the Examiner indicated that he did not consider the foreign patent document (i.e., WO 00/39666) and the non-patent literature document (i.e., Zimba, "mProductivity: Introduction, Technology, Architecture," ((c) 2000; www.zimba.com, visited September 9, 2000) that were cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated September 23, 2006, because he did not find copies of these references in the application file.

In a telephone conversation with the undersigned on February 16, 2006, the Examiner stated that copies of the above-mentioned foreign patent document and the non-patent literature document were in fact in the application file. The Examiner stated that he would consider these references and return with his next communication an initialed copy of the form PTO 1449 (2 pages) that was filed with the Information Disclosure Statement dated September 23, 2006.

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

A. The Examiner's position

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21, 23-30, and 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, "as failing to comply with the written description requirement."

With respect to the "wherein" clauses in the first paragraphs of the bodies of claims 1 and 11, the Examiner has stated that (emphasis added):

... Applicant has not provided support for the claimed limitations, as these claimed limitations go beyond what one having ordinary skill in the art could reasonably read from the cited passage. Applicant's originally-filed Specification does not set forth elements of "a label", "a messaging/collaboration server reference", or "messaging/collaboration data". Nor could one having ordinary skill in the art deduce the scope of "a label" as being commensurate with any or all of an XML structure, or an HTTP cookie, or a sessionID_Inbox.xml file. Similarly, one having ordinary skill in the art could not deduce that the scope of "a messaging/collaboration server reference" is commensurate with any or all of an XML structure, or an HTTP cookie, or a sessionID_Inbox.xml file. Applicant's Specification does not define the terms set forth by the claims, and one having ordinary skill in the art could not readily recognize that the scope of the claimed elements is contained within the originally-filed Specification. The scope of the terms recited in the claims cannot easily be translated into the elements disclosed by the Specification. Thus, Applicant's Specification does not define the terms of the claims with sufficient specificity as to inform one having ordinary skill in the art that Applicant had possession of the invention as now claimed at the time of filing.

B. Applicant's rebuttal

As noted by the Examiner, the specification need not contain a literal transcription of the claim language defining the invention in order to satisfy the written description requirement. Instead, the application need only reasonably convey the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the application need only reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the following subject matter:

wherein the access module additionally is configured to create a replacement reference identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference into the messaging/collaboration data, pass the replacement reference to the voice/wireless device without passing the data item, and store an association between the replacement reference and the messaging/collaboration server reference.

As explained in detail below, the application does in fact reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the quoted subject matter.

1. Creating A Replacement Reference Identifying A Data Item Identified By A Messaging/Collaboration Server Reference Into The Messaging/Collaboration Data

On page 18, lines 7-8, the specification teaches that:

... access module 120 stores on the server the following sessionID_Inbox.xml file, which contains references to the actual content of each of the corresponding sub-messages.

At the time the application was filed, it was well-known to persons skilled in the art that the Microsoft Exchange Server uses unique, global pseudo-random 128-bit GUID (Globally Unique IDentifier) numbers to identify items maintained in its messaging/collaboration folders (e.g., contacts, calendar, e-mail and tasks folders). It also was well-known to such persons that an application could retrieve an item for a Microsoft Exchange Server folder by sending the server the GUID for the folder and the GUID for the item.

The teaching on page 18, lines 7-8 of the specification is followed by the disclosure of the contents of the sessionID_Inbox.xml file on page 18, lines 10-34. One skilled in the art at the time the application was filed readily would have understood that the number listed on page 18, lines 11-14, is the GUID for the “Inbox” folder maintained by Microsoft Exchange Server. Such a person also would have understood that the 128-bit numbers following the brackets “>” in the ID=“[number]” statements in the sessionID_Inbox.xml file are messaging/collaboration server references because these numbers correspond to the GUID numbers that are used by Microsoft Exchange Server to identify messaging/collaboration items (i.e., messages) in the “Inbox” folder. Such a person also readily would have recognized that the numbers “1”, “2”, “3”, “4”, and “5”, which are preceded by the “ID=” statements in the sessionID_Inbox.xml file, are replacement references for the messaging/collaboration server references because these statements tell an XML parser to replace the respective ID type values (i.e., “1”, “2”, “3”, “4”, and “5”) with the associated messaging/collaboration server references.

Thus, from the disclosure on page 18, lines 6-34, one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would have understood that the access module 120 is configured to create a replacement reference (e.g., “1” on page 18, line 16) identifying a data item identified by a messaging/collaboration server reference (e.g., “000000005BEB8C6319E4D311AB5700902740B9F207004341EF5F8B4AD311AB4B00902740B9F

200000192D00400004341EF5F8B4AD311AB4B00902740B9F200000192D0510000" on page 18, lines 16-18) into the messaging/collaboration data.

2. Passing The Replacement Reference To The Wireless Device Without Passing The Data Item

On page 16, lines 16-19, the specification teaches that:

access module 120 manages sessions by creating XML structures for holding long variable names and references, and by passing only simple references (e.g., an HTTP cookie) to the destination device. When the destination device needs particular data, the simple reference may be replaced on the server with the actual referenced data, which may be passed to the messaging/collaboration server.

From this disclosure together with the disclosure on page 18, lines 6-34, one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would have understood that the access module 120 passes the replacement references to the destination device without passing the actual referenced data.

3. Storing An Association Between The Replacement Reference And The Messaging/Collaboration Server Reference

On page 18, lines 7-8, the specification teaches that the "access module 120 stores on the server" the sessionID_Inbox.xml file disclosed on page 18, lines 10-34. As explained above, one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed readily would have understood that the "ID=" statements in the sessionID_Inbox.xml file tell an XML parser to replace the respective ID type values (i.e., "1", "2", "3", "4", and "5") with the associated messaging/collaboration server references.

From this disclosure, one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would have understood that the access module 120 is configured to store an association between the replacement reference and the messaging/collaboration server reference.

4. Conclusion

As explained in detail below, the application provides sufficient disclosure to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the subject matter recited in the claims, including the subject matter recited in the "wherein" clauses in the first paragraphs of the bodies of claims 1 and 11.

Applicant : MAMOUN ABU-SAMAHA
Serial No. : 09/684,065
Filed : Oct. 6, 2000
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 10005265-1
Response dated Feb. 28, 2006
Reply to Office action dated Jan. 23, 2006

Therefore the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-21, 23-30, and 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Since the Examiner has not rejected any of the claims on the basis of any prior art, the pending claims now are in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons explained above, all claims are now in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Charge any excess fees or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2006


Edouard Garcia
Reg. No. 38,461
Telephone No.: (650) 289-0904

Please direct all correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599